Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

allowed his love of country, so we are to infer, to blind him to the evident fact that where a real difference exists between a specimen in the Curtis herbarium and one in the Berkeley herbarium, it is the latter only which is to be regarded as the type. This is so obviously true that we fear that Mr. Cooke was under some misapprehension when writing his warning. But while the simple statement seems to be beyond controversy, differences may still arise as to the interpretation of the Berkeley & Curtis types. Because a cursory examination appears to make out the type specimen in the Berkeley collection to be different from the corresponding specimen in the Curtis set, it does not necessarily follow that it is really so. It is quite possible that errors might have arisen in the original study, and that the specimen in the Curtis herbarium, although different, might yet be a better representative of the real species than the type specimen itself. There is often internal evidence to show that certain specimens in Herb. Curtis, although in some characters different, are still undoubtedly the same as those in Herb. Berkeley. For instance, if a leaf with a Puccinia has been cut in two and half sent to Rev. Berkeley and half placed in the Herb. Curtis, the description in many respects corresponding to the Curtis plant, but not in others, we are not to infer that there were two distinct things, but rather that the Curtis plant is genuine, and a study of it can show facts not previously brought out. There is so much need of cautious work in determining the species and settling the nomenclature of our fungi that it can not be amiss to point out this possible source of misunderstanding.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Minor Notices.

The flora of the Santa Barbara Islands is the subject of a paper[1] by Mr. T. S. Brandegee. The author investigated the two largest islands, Santa Cruz and Santa Rosa, and in the paper before us gives a list of the plants found. A comparison is made between this flora and that of the neighboring Santa Inez mountains on the mainland. Of the almost 400 species, nearly 380 may be considered as belonging to the San Diego flora, leaving some ten or twelve endemic species. There are, besides these, some nine or ten species not found on the mainland, but are common to other coast islands.

---

[1] Brandegee, T. S.—Flora of the Santa Barbara Islands. Reprint from Proc. Cal. Acad. Sci., 2d Ser., Vol. I, Part 2. pp. 201-226. Issued October, 1888.